

III. REMARKS

The Examiner is correct in that "OTM" stands for "Optical Translation Measurement". This has been added to claims 12, 25, 38 and 51. Thus, these claims are no longer objectionable.

The Examiner states that the expression "the motion of the terminal is identified using a camera to take at least two consecutive images" is not sufficiently described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. It is known in the art that the direction and the magnitude of a movement can be derived from consecutive images by using image processing techniques. Therefore the principle is not explained in the specification in further detail. We take herein as an example of such a prior art: Vasudev Bhaskaran, Konstantinos Konstantinides: Image and Video Compression Standards, Algorithms and Architectures, second edition, 1999 Kluwer Academic Publishers, pages 3-5 and 99-104.

It is therefore submitted that claims 13, 26, 39 and 52 conform to 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The independent claims have been amended to delete references to moving a display or portion thereof. Thus, the control of the game is based on the movements of an object proportional to the terminal. Claims 13, 26, 39 and 52 now recite that it is the motion of the object which a camera identifies. Thus, the function of the camera is now clear.

Thus, the claims satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Masuyama et al. does not teach that the movement of an object (target) on the screen is proportional to the movement of another object compared to the terminal as is said in independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 40. In the light of the claim amendments the independent claims are novel.

When it comes to the archery game, we respectfully disagree with the Examiner. In prior art games designed for portable terminals, (tennis shot, football kick, golf shot, high/long jump) a joystick or a push-button and the visual response on the screen are required. There are no prior art games, where the strain of a bow is modelled by determining or observing the distance between different objects. Therefore, it is not obvious for a person skilled in the art to introduce an archery game of the application.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of \$1020 for a three-month extension of time and additional claim fees as well as any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

Feb. 3, 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 119
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: 2/3/05

Signature: Doris W. Perman
Person Making Deposit